

## REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that Claims 1 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over the U.S. patent to Kawamura in view of the U.S. patents to Kikuchi, Kirschbaum and Pleiss.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected as above, and further in view of the patent to Tiarks.

After carefully considering the Examiner's grounds for rejection of the claims, applicants retained the claims as they were.

The specification has been amended in formal aspects to provide the reference to the priority application, to introduce corresponding headings, and to eliminate references to claims in the body of the specification.

It is respectfully submitted that the new features of the present invention as defined in Claim 1 clearly and patentably distinguish the present invention from the prior art applied by the Examiner.

Turning now to the prior art applied by the Examiner and in particular to the patent to Kawamura, it can be seen that Figure 2 of this reference discloses a three-phase, four-pole winding, in column 6, starting from line 31. Therefore, 12 slots are provided per pole, so that these 12 slots of one pole cover total 180 electrical degree. This means that the distance the neighboring slots amounts of 15 electrical degrees. In no coils in Figure 2 the slot section has a distance of 12 slots, so that no slot shown there have a distance of electrical 180 degree.

It should be mentioned that for example a phase U is composed of the conductors, which are identified by the abbreviations U1, U2, U3 and U4 (column 6, lines 34-36). This first phase is illustrated by a continuous line. The second phase V (V1-V4, column 6, lines 36-38) is illustrated by a dash line. The third phase W (W1-W4, column 6, lines 38-40) is shown by a dash-dot line.

Regardless of which coils of the individual phases U, V and W are identified as the first coil or the second coil, none of these coils have coil sides which are spaced from one another by 180 electrical degrees.

In the Office Action the Examiner's statement with respect to Claim 1 which is supported in column 5, lines 10-22, deals not with a 60°

angle inside one phase, but instead with  $60^\circ$  angle between two phases. Correspondingly, this part of the specification deals with at least two phases, which have a feature or a property relative to one another that embrace  $60^\circ$  (electrical=electric angle). Such a feature is not defined in Claim 1 of the present application.

Claim 1 defines a stator in which the second winding (27) is offset from the first winding (24) in a first direction, and the offset amounts  $180^\circ/m$ , wherein  $M=3$ , so that an offset of 60 electrical degrees is provided, and this relationship is a relationship between a first and a second coil, which is a part of a single phase winding. The description provided in column 5, starting from line 10 of the above mentioned description deals with, as stated, however, with a property of two phases relative to one another.

On page 4 of the Office Action the Examiner indicated that the patent to Kikuchi discloses windings, which are arranged at intervals at  $180^\circ$  relative to one another. Claim 1 of the present application, however, defines 180 electrical degrees (electric angle). This 180 electrical degrees does not correspond to 180 mechanical degrees, as in the patent to Kikuchi. The  $180^\circ$  electrical are different from  $180^\circ$  mechanical, as can be seen from Figure 14 of the reference.

The Examiner further stated in the Office Action that the patent to Kirschbaum discloses that a first coil in each of the coil groups has a number of turns which differs from the number of turns of the other coil. It is not clear what this feature has to do with applicant's invention as defined in Claim 1.

As for the patent to Pleiss, the Examiner cites column 5, lines 20-32, with associated Figures 4 and 5. The angle data of  $180^\circ$  electrical is exchanged with  $180^\circ$  mechanical. In this citation coils spaced mechanically by  $180^\circ$  relative to one another are disclosed. On one hand, a second set of three coils (16'') must be inserted in the slots 1, 2 and 3, as well as 10, 11 and 12. Furthermore, a second group 19 of coil units 9 is described, which must be inserted in the slots 19, 20 and 21 as well as 28, 29 and 30. The distance between the coils in the slots 1-3, 10-12, 19-21 and 28-30 must be  $180^\circ$

It can be clearly seen from Figure 5 that the corresponding distance is a distance of  $180^\circ$  mechanical, as in Figure 5 these both "coil groups" are located in a circumferential direction relative to one another. This clearly means that the "second coils" with their "coil sides" in the slots 19, 20, 21 and 28, 29, 30 are spaced from the "first coil" in the slots 1, 2 and 3, as well as 10, 11 and 12, not by  $180^\circ$  electrical degrees.

It is respectfully submitted that a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made would not modify the invention disclosed in the patent to Kawamura by the teachings of the patents to Kikuchi, Kirschbaum and Pleiss, since the features disclosed in them are not combinable with the claimed present invention.

The stator of a three-phase generator defined in Claim 1 cannot be derived from the teachings of the Kikuchi, Kirschbaum and Pleiss references.

It is believed to be clear that Claim 1, the broadest claim on file, should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

As for Claims 2-7, these claims depend on Claim 1, they share its allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that they should be allowed as well.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in

formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 27233